

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 and 13-28 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-10 and 13-28 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 13-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,301,586 (hereinafter “Yang”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-10 and 13-28 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) based on Yang.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. Moreover, the prior art reference must show the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claims with the elements arranged as required by the claims. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Yang teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-10 and 13-28. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-10 and 13-28.

Amended claim 1 recites the limitation of “extracting from each corresponding file in the file system the identified portions of video information or audio information in the multimedia information with the processor of the computer system including at least a first portion of video information or audio information extracted by the processor directly from a first multimedia document stored as an individual file in the file system and a second portion of video

information or audio information extracted by the processor directly from a second multimedia document stored as an individual file in the file system.” Yang however does not extract audio or video information from individual files as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges on page 12 that “Yang discloses that the user queries and searches video clips in MOMA thereby searching a portion of the multimedia information, a first, a second a third etc, limited only by the storage capacity of the database itself.” Thus, Yang’s use of a database to retrieve clips is different in detail from extracting identified portions of video information or audio information from each corresponding file in a file system as recited in amended claim 1.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree that Yang discloses the limitation recited in claim 6 of analyzing a printable representation for a first and second multimedia document to identify at least one portion of the printable representations that satisfy selection criterion. The Office Action merely alleges on page 13 that Yang “allows the user to modify the layout of the selected multimedia clips.” Modifying a layout as in Yang merely means to change how or where a printable representation of a clip is placed on a page. Applicants respectfully submit that changing the placement of a printable representation as in Yang does not teach or suggest identifying at least one portion of a printable representation that satisfies selection criterion as recited in claim 6. Yang does not disclose or suggest that the individual printable representations of images, video clips, or audio clips or a printable representation of a page after multimedia clips have been laid out according to a modified layout are analyzed as recited in claim 6 to identify portions that satisfy selection criteria.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Yang fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that Yang fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in claim 6. None of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Yang, and thus, amended claim 1 and claim 6 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining independent claims are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 6, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or

indirectly from the independent claims, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:Ils
62434981 v1